



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,489	11/19/2001	Hsing Kong Wu	A-71154/MAK	7236

7590

04/28/2004

Michael A. Kaufman
Flehr Hohbach Test Albritton & Herbert LLP
Suite 3400
Four Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4187

EXAMINER

WASSUM, LUKE S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/997,489

Applicant(s)

WU ET AL.

Examiner

Luke S. Wassum

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.
2. The instant application claims priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon Taiwanese patent application 090110774, filed 4 May 2001. The provisions of 35 U.S.C. 119 having been complied with, a priority date of 4 May 2001 is established.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because of the following informalities:

Abbreviated terms appearing in the drawing labels are not disclosed in the specification, for example, ODBC and DSN in Figures 1-5. These terms require either explicit definition in the specification, or the abbreviations must be expanded to the full name terms in the drawing labels.

Numeric labeling of the elements of the drawings and reference to said numeric labels in the specification would greatly aid in making the disclosure more understandable, particularly since the disclosure is not always consistent with the corresponding elements of the drawings. For instance, the specification refers to 'the authentication process' regarding Figure 1, but the corresponding feature in Figure 1 is labeled 'Read ODBC DSN'. Another example is where the specification cites that the migration mode is decided, but the corresponding feature in Figure 1 is labeled 'Transmission Option'.

Art Unit: 2177

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 3, line 36, 'DBSM' should be 'DBMS'.

There are numerous instances where the disclosure is not fully consistent, or does not fully explain all of the elements of the corresponding drawing figure.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The claim is in the form of a method, but limitation (e) is written in means plus function form. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2177

7. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

8. Regarding claims 1 and 11, there are numerous terms cited in the claims, including migration mode, data picture, screen element, execution rule and detected source, which are not disclosed in the specification to a sufficient degree as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention.

9. Claims 2-10, incorporating the deficiencies of their parent claims, are likewise rejected.

10. Claim 5 is furthermore rejected, because the specification cites the fact that data can be output as XML web page files, but not that source files may be XML web page files.

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2177

13. Regarding claims 1 and 11, the fact that the terms cited above are not disclosed in the specification renders the claims indefinite.

14. Claims 2-10, incorporating the deficiencies of their parent claims, are likewise rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

16. Claims 1, 4 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Abrams** (U.S. Patent 6,151,608).

17. Regarding claim 1, **Abrams** teaches a system for dynamically exchanging heterogeneous databases in real time as claimed, comprising:

- a) database migration means for executing data migration by selecting a source database and a destination database, and then selecting source data table as a basis for selecting migration mode (see col. 6, lines 1-15);
- b) relational table establishing means for defining a displayed relational field and exporting data module after selecting a source database and source data table (see col. 6, lines 16-27);

- c) data table export means for executing data export by selecting source database and selecting an export destination means (see col. 6, lines 1-27);
 - d) data table import means for executing data import by selecting a source file and selecting destination table according to said source file selection and setting table mapping field (see col. 6, lines 1-27);
 - e) data mapping rule means for mapping the data field via multiple operation means and an automatically encode and interpretation system after selecting source (see col. 6, lines 28-58; see also col. 12, lines 23-45);
 - f) screen data control mapping means for mapping a data file for storage and activating application program by sending a data picture, reading screen element, and setting a name of the element for storage and selecting storage element after selecting data picture (see disclosure of the use of templates, col. 12, lines 35-45); and
 - g) data rule detecting means for setting execution rule and importing schedule after setting executing timing, selecting detected source, and selecting target (see col. 7, lines 66-67; see also col. 13, lines 12-17).
18. Regarding claim 11, **Abrams** teaches a method for dynamically exchanging heterogeneous databases in real time as claimed, comprising the steps of:
- a) transferring database table for executing data migration by selecting a source database and a destination database, and then selecting source data table as a basis for selecting migration mode (see col. 6, lines 1-15);
 - b) establishing relational table for defining a displayed relational field and exporting data module after selecting a source database and source data table (see col. 6, lines 16-27);

- c) exporting data table for executing data export by selecting source database and selecting an export destination means (see col. 6, lines 1-27);
- d) importing data table for executing data import by selecting a source file and selecting destination table according to said source file selection and setting table mapping field (see col. 6, lines 1-27);
- e) data mapping rule means for mapping the data field via multiple operation means and an automatically encode and interpretation system after selecting source (see col. 6, lines 28-58; see also col. 12, lines 23-45);
- f) mapping screen data control for mapping a data file for storage and activating application program by sending a data picture, reading screen element, and setting a name of the element for storage and selecting storage element after selecting data picture (see disclosure of the use of templates, col. 12, lines 35-45); and
- g) detecting data rule for setting execution rule and importing schedule after setting executing timing, selecting detected source, and selecting target (see col. 7, lines 66-67; see also col. 13, lines 12-17).

19. Regarding claim 4, **Abrams** additionally teaches a system wherein said source file is a text file (see disclosure that the source could be an ASCII file, col. 6, lines 16-27).

20. Regarding claims 6-10, **Abrams** additionally teaches a system wherein said multiple operation is an operation for data table relation, functional operation, data combination, constants or variables (see disclosure regarding data mapping and conversion, col. 7, lines 12-61, et seq.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

23. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2177

24. Claims 2, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Abrams** (U.S. Patent 6,151,608) as applied to claims 1, 4 and 6-11 above, and further in view of **Chang et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,308,178).

25. Regarding claims 2, 3 and 5, **Abrams** teaches a system for dynamically exchanging heterogeneous databases in real-time substantially as claimed.

Abrams does not explicitly teach a system wherein the source file is a data file, spreadsheet file or an XML web page file.

Chang et al., however, teaches a system wherein the source file is a data file, spreadsheet file or an XML web page file (see source applications 12 in Figure 1; see also col. 4, lines 7-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to institute a system wherein the source files can be data files, spreadsheet files or an XML web page files, since intelligent management, manipulation and maintenance of organization-wide data requires an integration system capable of providing data transfer interfaces among the various heterogeneous applications employed throughout the organization (see col. 1, lines 26-37).

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Williamson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,873,093) teaches a system that maps object classes in an object-oriented environment to a data source, including relationships between properties of each object class and data of the data source.

Daudenarde (U.S. Patent 5,995,973) teaches a method for maintaining object relationships in relationship tables.

Williamson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,122,641) teaches a system that maps object classes in an object-oriented environment to a data source, including relationships between properties of each object class and data of the data source.

MacLeod et al. (U.S. Patent 6,356,901) teaches a system for import, transform and export of data between heterogeneous data sources and destinations.

Ding et al. (U.S. Patent 6,615,202) teaches a method for specifying a database import/export operation through a graphical user interface.

Williamson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,704,744) teaches a system that maps object classes in an object-oriented environment to a data source, including relationships between properties of each object class and data of the data source.

IBM ("Foreign Column Specification for Database Import/Export") teaches methods for a user to control the selection of columns from a foreign file when importing data from the foreign file into a relational database.

PR Newswire ("SmartDB Announces First Software Solution to Simplify Enterprise Data Integration") is a product announcement for version 4.0 of the SmartDB Workbench.

Fazio ("SmartDB Workbench 4.1: The Easiest and Fastest Way to Integrate Enterprise Applications") is a slide presentation outlining the features of version 4.1 of the SmartDB Workbench.

Schumacher (“Cleaning House”) is a product review of version 4.0 of the SmartDB Workbench.

PR Newswire (“Constellar Pioneers Batch + Messaging Application Integration with IBM MQSeries Connectivity”) is a product announcement of version 3.0 of Constellar Hub.

PR Newswire (“Constellar Targets Dominance in Oracle Application Conversion and Interface Market”) is a press release announcing Constellar Corporation’s plans for version 3.0 of Constellar Hub.

PR Newswire (“SmartDB Previews Updated Application Integration Solution at Oracle Conference”) is a press release announcing the introduction of version 5.0 of the SmartDB Workbench.

Johnson (“Making Oracle Applications Easier”) is a product review of the Crystallize product.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 703-305-5706. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

In addition, INFORMAL or DRAFT communications may be faxed directly to the examiner at 703-746-5658.

Customer Service for Tech Center 2100 can be reached during regular business hours at (703) 306-5631, or fax (703) 746-7240.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Luke S. Wassum
Art Unit 2177

lsw
28 April 2004